

BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

P.O. Box 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460
(916) 653-8007
(916)653-0989 FAX
Website: www.fire.ca.gov



MINUTES
BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
November 5 & 6, 2002
Sacramento, California

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT :

Stan Dixon, Chairman
Kirk Marckwald, Vice Chair
Mark Bosetti
Susan Britting
Robert Heald
David Nawi
Tharon O'Dell
Gary Ryneerson

BOARD STAFF PRESENT :

Daniel R. Sendek, Executive Officer
George Gentry
Executive Officer, Foresters Licensing
Donna Stadler, Executive Assistant
Jim Mote, Regulations Coordinator

DEPARTMENTAL STAFF PRESENT :

Andrea Tuttle, Director
Ross Johnson, Deputy Director
Resource Management

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Dixon called the November 2002 meeting of the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection to order.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chairman Dixon commented that he had been out of the state most of October, therefore, he had nothing to report.

PRESENTATION OF BOARD RESOLUTION TO THE MENDOCINO COUNTY COOPERATIVE AERIAL FIRE PATROL

Chief Dan Matson, CDF Mendocino Unit, introduced his guests and the recipient of the resolution; Mr. Jack Sweeley. He provided some history of the Aerial Fire Patrol and Mr. Sweeley's forestry career. He noted that Mr. Sweeley is retired and is RPF 95.

Chairman Dixon read the resolution into the record and congratulated Mr. Sweeley. He then presented him with the Resolution.

Mr. Sweeley commented that he was honored to represent the program and to receive this commendation on behalf of the Mendocino County Cooperative Aerial Fire Patrol. He thanked the Board for the Resolution and Chief Matson for his support. He noted that the Aerial Fire Patrol has discovered 930 fires since 1950.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Ms. Andrea Tuttle, Director of Forestry and Fire Protection, congratulated Mr. Sweeley and commented that Mendocino County was a shining example. CDF is in the transition period with regards to the fire season, but the lack of rain is of concern. The Department is reducing staffing on engines in the North, but not in the South. The burn ban will continue until the state gets some measurable rainfall. She reviewed the fire season for the Board. She then commended the Regions for the strong initial attack efforts during fire season this year.

Director Tuttle reported that she had been in Reno last week for a three-state meeting of fire managers on federal and state lands from California, Hawaii, and Nevada.

Director Tuttle commented that she had attended the Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Foresters in Vermont. Every state has a state forester and one of the topics on Vermont's agenda was the implementation of the National Fire Plan. The cost of suppression for the Forest Service budget was around \$300 million. They did not have the ability to go for a deficiency bill and had to divert funds from every other program they had in order to pay the expenses. She commented that the state and private forestry programs have been impacted in all states. The Tahoe Re-green funds were also diverted. Most of the grant applications for California had already been approved, so the funds were not hit as bad as in other states. This is a matter for Congress if these funds are going to be reimbursed.

Director Tuttle reported that she had been invited to attend the United Nations FAO meeting in Rome regarding harmonizing of forest definitions. This was the second of two meetings of experts from around the world; discussing forest sequestration issues is very important.

Director Tuttle reported that as part of the Farm Bill that went through Congress over the summer, there was a program called The Forest Land Enhancement Program (FLEP); the rules are just being developed. Over the next five years, over \$100 million has been authorized nationally. California will put its portion of the funds into its CFIP program. This will provide additional funding for enhancing non-industrial landowner rehabilitation management plans and the various plans available through CFIP.

Director Tuttle commented on the tragic events involving the USFS aircraft crashes. As a result, a blue ribbon committee had been appointed and has been moving around the country holding hearings. CDF's Chief of Aviation gave a presentation on the CDF model and how CDF runs its aviation program. The FS was looking at that model and also heavy helicopters and was very interested in the CDF model. She commented that CDF's model works because of a program called the Federal Excess Property Program (FEPP) where CDF gets its parts. That program is in jeopardy because following September 11, 2001, the priorities for qualifying for federal excess property have changed and the fire services went to the bottom of the list. Congress may be taking this issue up in the next few weeks.

Director Tuttle reviewed the state budget for the Board. CDF will be affected both during this current year and next year. The Legislation that was signed by the Governor requires a 6,000-person reduction in the state's workforce. The Department lost a number of positions and this issue is going to be time consuming. She reported that the bug kill issue in the Idyllwild, San Bernardino, and Riverside area has drawn public attention and they are looking for state and federal assistance in removing dead trees.

Director Tuttle announced that Humboldt State University is advertising a new full-time position in forest policy and administration. The Humboldt State Forestry program is up for accreditation review by Society American Foresters this year. She urged the Board to distribute this announcement to any colleagues that may be interested in the position.

REPORT OF THE OAK MORTALITY TASK FORCE

Mr. Mark Stanley, California Oak Mortality Task Force Chair (COMTF), reviewed the COMTF report in the Board binder for the members. He noted dates to remember: October 26 through November 11, 2002, "The Art of Saving Oaks" art auction and exhibit at the Bay Model, Sausalito; December 15, 2002, Field trip to Pfeiffer Big Sur State park; December 16, 2002, COMTF General Meeting in Monterey at the Monterey Marriott Hotel; and December 16 through 18, 2002, the SOD Research Symposium in Monterey at the Monterey Marriott Hotel. This report may be obtained through the Board Office, or online at <http://www.suddenoakdeath.org>.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF COUNTY ACTION PLAN ADDRESSING SUDDEN OAK DEATH HAZARD TREE REMOVAL AND DISPOSITION

Mr. Stephen Jones, Deputy Chief, CDF Pest Management, introduced the Deputy Agricultural Commissioner for Alameda County, Ronnie Eaton, to the Board. He presented the Board with the Alameda County Sudden Oak Death Hazard Tree Assessment, Removal, and SOD Restoration Plan. He requested that the Board take action to approve the Plan. This Plan follows the format of the previous plans the Board has approved for Marin, Sonoma, Monterey, and Santa Cruz Counties. The COMTF Board has reviewed the Alameda County Plan and the Chair of the Task Force has provided a letter to the Board recommending approval. He noted that the Department also recommends that the Plan be approved. He commented that he or Ms. Eaton would be available for questions.

Mr. Rynearson wanted to know how large the infestation was.

Ms. Ronnie Eden, Deputy Agricultural Commissioner for Alameda County, indicated that there had been one confirmed location in Castro Valley and another on the Contra Costa County line. There are approximately 15 to 20 trees involved. She provided pictures for the Board to view.

02-11-1 Mr. Rynearson moved to approve the Plan as submitted. Dr. Britting seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

Mr. Jones commented that no other plans have come forth. Invoices have begun to come in, and Santa Cruz County was going out to bid.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AGENCIES INCLUDING USDA FOREST SERVICE, NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE, US FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE AND US ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

No reports this month.

PUBLIC FORUM

Mr. Ed Ehlers, Association of California Loggers (ACL), commented that this winter ACL will be introducing a new loggers certification program. It will be performance based and called the Master Loggers Certification Program. He commented that ACL has reviewed the Licensed Timber Operators (LTO) list and discovered between August 1995 and August 2002 there was a 27 percent reduction in the number of LTOs in California. In the last year there has been a near 6 percent reduction, which involved the loss of approximately 535 logging companies.

Mr. Vince Taylor, Campaign to Restore Jackson Demonstration State Forest, provided handouts for the Board. He wanted to correct a clerical error and how the amendment was processed and incorporated into the policies. He provided some background for the Board. He believed that the time for public review was limited. He referred to Section 0351.10, in the Resource Protection Code, of the recommended policy change for the JDSF Management Plan, dated July 9, 2001, the fifth paragraph beginning with the word "Accordingly," the sentence it refers to was not amended, but disappeared. He asked that the Board review this Section and decide if that was what it meant to do. He wanted Board discussion on this issue.

Chairman Dixon commented that if the Board wished to question the issue, it would have to be on an agenda in the future, but not under Public Forum.

Mr. Taylor commented that he thought that the deletion of the sentence in question was a clerical oversight. He then reviewed some suggested changes. He believes that there should be a time certain for the preparation of a new management plan and believes that every 10 years with a five year review would be best. He suggested that there should be in the language a time certain for proposed amendments, possibly two or three years and that the Board is responsible for oversight of the preparation of the Management Plan.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Daniel Sendek, Executive Officer for the Board, commented that the Board had met in Executive Session to discuss two matters, but no action was taken.

MINUTES

Chairman Dixon asked for a motion on the September and October minutes.

02-11-2 Mr. O'Dell moved to approve the September and October 2002 minutes as amended. Mr. Heald seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

PRESENTATION AND REVIEW OF THE REVISED JACKSON DEMONSTRATION STATE FOREST (JDSF) MANAGEMENT PLAN, INCLUDING RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

Chairman Dixon introduced the topic. He reported that Member Rynearson had recused himself because his firm was involved as a sub-contractor in the preparation of the EIR. He asked Member Marckwald to comment on this issue since he was the Acting Chair during this item at the October meeting.

Mr. Marckwald noted that during the Lake Tahoe meeting last month, there was public comment and several members of the public expressed their views and made suggestions on the changes. The Department will comment on some of the ideas that came forth. Since the new members had not had the opportunity to review the draft, the Board decided to put the item over until this meeting.

Mr. Daniel Sendek, Executive Officer for the Board, announced that the Board would be accepting public comment of this item in accordance with the Bagley-Keene Act, Government Code 11125.7, which he then read into the record. As stated that during the October 2002 meeting, comments would be limited to only new information.

Mr. Ross Johnson, Deputy Director, commented that during the October 2002 meeting the Department provided a presentation on the JDSF Management Plan. The Board had questions for the Department and today it will respond to those questions. The Department would like for the Board to approve the Plan today.

Mr. Norm Hill, Chief Counsel for the Department, addressed the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) issue involved with the proposed management plan. He provided his written comments to the Board and read them into the record. He commented that the Board has broad discretion for the decision of whether, or how to approve the proposed management plan, and that the decision would be subject to CEQA. The actions of the Board and CDF regarding the management plan are closely related and need to be coordinated under CEQA. He referred to the Lead Agency Agreement whereby CDF would act as the Lead Agency for the management plan and the Board would act as the Responsible Agency. In summary, the Board is required to accept the adequacy of the certified EIR, but must still consider the information in that EIR as it makes its decision on the management plan. The Board has broad powers in deciding whether or how to approve the management plan. If, the Board makes changes in the Plan, it will need to review those changes to see if they would cause any new significant

environmental effects that had not been analyzed in the EIR. If there would be any new significant effects, the Board would need to consider preparing a supplement to the EIR and conduct a new CEQA process.

Dr. Britting expressed her concern regarding snag retention. She believes that the language is a little ambiguous.

Mr. Mark Jamison, Deputy Chief and Manager of JDSF, commented that the language regarding snags could be addressed by EIR mitigations by simply adding the words, "retain snags in harvest areas until retention standards are met."

Mr. Heald wanted to know if snags would be removed for fire protection and hazard conditions.

Mr. Jamison replied that snags would be retained, per the Forest Practice Rules.

Mr. Heald would like to see specific wording used.

Dr. Britting commented that there should be specific implementation timelines.

Mr. Johnson indicated that the issue of timelines is something that the Board could ask for in review of the Plan's implementation process, which would take three to six months as a follow-up to the Plan.

Dr. Britting commented that the adoption of the Department of Fish and Game's (DFG) plant guidelines for botanical surveys for rare plants in the management plan have been adopted in concept and she expressed a desire for them to be adopted as opposed to "in concept." The DFG guidelines are clear saying that the surveys need to be floristic in nature and that the people doing the surveys need to be capable of identifying the variety of plants. She wanted some assurance that there would be qualified people out there on the ground looking for not only the five targets, but are capable of spotting a new species.

Mr. Johnson commented that the Department would work with DFG on methods of plant surveys.

Dr. Britting referred to the Sierra Club letter and wanted to know the volumes associated with statements on harvest areas and the economic effect of doing some deferring.

Mr. Jamison commented that the economic impact would be severe. To defer the mature timber stands and go log younger stands are not a good way to manage the forest.

Mr. Heald wanted to know if the Department could look at its list of approximately 25 or 27 sale areas that are on a five-year schedule and tell the Board whether or not, in the next two years, the Department could defer some of those plans for a year or two while further evaluation is done.

Mr. Jamison there may be some that could be deferred, but it would be limited.

Mr. Heald wanted to know about Camp Three and Brandon Gulch.

Mr. Jamison commented that those were approved THPs, so all the work has been done. It would create staff difficulty if plans were deferred where all the work has been done.

There was some further discussion.

Mr. Johnson reiterated that the Department had already identified almost 11,000 acres of the forest that will be in late seral and in areas where it believes will provide the most benefit.

Public comment

Mr. William Giuggio believes that the focus seems to be to revise the use of logging, not to protect the forests. He commented that in area seven there are few buffers near streams. He believes that there is little protection of watersheds provided where clear-cutting is planned and that the state should provide a higher level of protection.

Mr. Scott Stevens, Forests Forever, commented that they collected over 1,600 comments in opposition to this plan. He expressed concern over the even-aged management issue and urged the Board not to approve the Plan with even-aged management.

Mr. Bill Heil, Jackson State Owners Association, believes that JDSF needs an independent review. The economics seem to be driving harvest decisions. He commented that it is time to increase stand management by stand improvement harvests. He does not believe that an industrial model is appropriate for JDSF. He commented that road right-of-ways are clear-cut to 100 feet on each side.

Mr. Vince Taylor, Campaign to Restore Jackson State Demonstration Forest, commented that there had been approximately 2000 email and faxes opposing the Plan. He asked that the Board defer approval until the Plan and the EIR are corrected. He commented that the public wants low impact management, not industrial logging. He believes that there will be serious problems by shortening the averaging period of harvest estimation. There is a need to take additional time to review public comments and the Board should look at the forest on a large scale. He believes that the Board should send the Plan back to the Department because there are serious problems. He reviewed his handout for the Board.

Ms. Kathy Bailey, Sierra Club, provided the Board with a map for its review. She asked that the Board not adopt the JDSF Management Plan. She commented that litigation happens for a reason. She recommended that there be a joint CDF and DFG report in two years. She commented that the proposed harvests are designed for maximum timber production, not late seral. The Sierra Club would like the deferral of harvest of older stands until CDF returns with a revised proposal of the harvest schedule. The Plan shows that less than 10 percent of the forest would be in late seral. The Sierra Club suggests an amendment to the EIR. She commented that it made sense that the Board take time to review all of the comments; it would benefit the Board and the public.

Mr. Mark Rentz, California Forestry Association (CFA), commented that CFA supports the approval of the Management Plan. He believes that the public concerns were addressed within the process. The Caspar Creek Study shows little difference in the impact between even and uneven-aged harvest. He urged the Board to adopt the Plan.

Mr. Dan Weldon, Forest Landowners of California (FLOC), indicated that the FLOC supports the Plan and urges speedy adoption of the Management Plan. He commented that the Forest Resource Improvement Fund (FRIF) benefits small landowners.

Dr. Marty Berbach, Department of Fish and Game (DFG), believes that this plan provides the opportunity for CDF and DFG to work together on an informal consultation process. He commented that THP preparation is focused on plant review and he agreed to work with CDF on demonstration of floristic surveys.

Ms. Kathryn Gerwig provided written comments and reviewed them for the Board. She indicated that she has worked in follow-up management of clear-cut areas, and commented that clear-cutting does not work. Fire hazard is high on forest. She commented that Oregon and Washington are making recycled wood products, which is better. The public has a special interest in redwoods.

Chairman Dixon asked for Board discussion.

Dr. Britting wanted to know how the harvest would change if Camp Three and Brandon Gulch were to go from uneven-age management to late seral.

Mr. Jamison commented that there are several ways in which it could be done. One way would be to imitate the natural processes with the initial harvest by creating small openings that would normally be found in an old growth forest; this creates an opportunity for under-story development. He commented that these are even-aged stands that developed from clear-cut. This is a viable first step and could be used in other areas that would produce late seral development.

Mr. O'Dell wanted to know if the Department foresees a species substitution to invade those stands with a gap management in the close management types.

Mr. Jamison commented that the minor species present in those stands, which are on the shade tolerant side, would include grand fir, hemlock, and tan oak. In other areas, CDF has gone in uneven-aged managed areas and did some stocking control.

Mr. Heald wanted to know about the timeframe for replacement THPs.

Mr. Jamison indicated it could take up to one year.

Mr. Marckwald wanted to know the Department's perspective on where the forest has been and where it is going.

Mr. Jamison commented that approximately 70 percent of the forest has been harvested with even-aged methods going back to the late 1960s. The Department is proposing to manage 29 percent of the forest with even-aged methods, but over a very long period of time. It will occur in increments over a 150-year period.

Mr. Marckwald wanted to know if the Department believed the rotation period would be substantially longer than it has been.

Mr. Jamison commented that it would be much longer and that it would be on the typical industrial ownerships. It is the intent of the Department to demonstrate stands out to 150 years and in addition allow certain elements to sustain themselves for much longer periods of time.

Mr. O'Dell wanted a visual image of what it was like in 1948 on this land-base when it was required by the State of California in terms of the amount of even-aged management and what has happened since that time under state management.

Mr. Jamison commented that the forest was purchased by the State of California in 1947. By that time, approximately 65 percent of the forest had been clear-cut and burned. In most cases the stands were left to regenerate naturally. The Department continued with the removal of residual old growth on the east end. In the 1960's the Department began instituting selection cuttings toward the west end of the forest in the older even-aged second growth stands and then proceeded eastward.

Mr. Marckwald commented that he believes that the Department has worked very hard to listen and do outreach and legally sufficient things to make sure this is the best possible plan. However, there are very broad differences. He wanted to know how the Board could be sure that the legitimate concerns would be addressed in the future.

Mr. Johnson indicated that the Department has spent a lot of time on this plan and tried to address all of the issues. It has 23 percent of the land base, which will grow to be big old trees or late seral. The Department also had to demonstrate even-aged and uneven-aged systems. The Department is willing to come back to the Board at any time with progress reports.

Mr. Marckwald wanted to know if, when the Department comes back to the Board, and there is a significant change, would that require an amendment and would it be supported by a supplement to the EIR, or would it require a new EIR.

Mr. Johnson commented that with any significant change, the Department would have to determine if further CEQA review is required.

Chairman Dixon asked if there were any further question for the Department.

Mr. Marckwald wanted to hear more about the DFG collaboration.

Mr. Jamison commented that in those areas where there are large blocks designated for late seral, the Department would consult with DFG and the USFWS and in the special treatment areas, the Department would

also be talking with the Department of Parks and Recreation. That process would occur before harvest of those areas. In summation, he commented that this was a long and involved process. He believes that a lot of what is being asked by the public is a departure from statute and policy. The Department will augment late seral and snag areas and will report back to the Board upon request. There are over 50 ongoing research and demonstration projects. There is a very detailed harvesting schedule and it would be difficult to change. He believes that the Department's obligation has been fulfilled.

Chairman Dixon indicated that he would like for the Board to consider some kind of action on this plan. It is important not to depart from statutory standards. He supports approving the Plan today. He believes that the Department has done a good job.

Mr. Heald commented that he also believes that the Department has done a good job, and it is clear that they have been responsive to concerns. He believes that sustainable natural resource protection is the role of the demonstration forests and that the JDSF is moving in that direction. He would like to see the Plan go into the implementation phase and that he is prepared to give approval at this time. He commented that there are elements which can be improved upon and suggest that the Board identify those areas and request that the Department come back with a report in one year on research plans and with desired future conditions on late seral and cluster selection in more detail, preferably in the Camp Three and Brandon Gulch areas.

Dr. Britting agreed with Member Heald that the JDSF is a demonstration forest. She believes that there is need for more detail on what constitutes variable retention and elements retained for late seral. She suggested that this be a detailed report. She wanted to see an implementation plan with a timeline and budget. She suggested that DFG and CDF meet soon on late seral management.

Mr. Nawi expressed concern about the distance between CDF and the public and believes that this could be a public disagreement with statutory mandate. He believes that the Department should bring items to the Board with greater degree on consensus.

Mr. O'Dell complimented everyone who worked so long and hard to get this far. When agencies are willing to work together what more can be done for the public. Demonstrations have to cover a large range and will not always please all parties. He believes that this is a good plan, which will be influenced over time by the public.

Mr. Marckwald suggested that the language on page four be changed to "thoroughly reviewed every five years." He indicated that the Department should respond sooner on the ability to work with adjacent and close landowners. He commented that one year for an update would be good, but would like an earlier update on the implementation efforts.

Chairman Dixon wanted to know if one motion would suffice, or would there need to be two.

Mr. Bruce Reeves, Deputy Attorney General and Counsel for the Board, commented that it would be at the Board's discretion.

Mr. Nawi wanted to know if findings were required.

Mr. Reeves commented that findings would not be necessary if accepted as is. However, the Board must state that it considered the document, the certification, and the findings of the Department; it would be advisable for it to be reflected in the motion.

02-11-3 Mr. Heald moved that the Board adopt the Plan as presented with the following modifications and that it determines that these minor changes are totally consistent with the environmental analysis in the impact report it received and reviewed:

1. That on page four, the policy statement with respect to revision be changed from: "the Forest Management Plan is expected to be reviewed at least every five years..." to "the Forest Management Plan will be thoroughly reviewed every five years..." as suggested by Member Marckwald.

2. That the Department develop and bring to the Board within a year, as is consistent with its policy for revision, a more thoroughly developed demonstration and research plan.
3. That the Department develop and bring to the Board a more detailed description of the desired future conditions of individual tree selection/cluster management and a comparison with the desired future conditions for late successional stage management in upland areas. This may be done either as a detailed example, or as a proposed plan amendment, whichever the Department believes appropriate, and that it does that before they begin implementing the harvest on Camp Three and Brandon Gulch.
4. That the Department bring to the Board, within one year, a more detailed description of the use of variable retention, again either as a very specific example or as a proposed plan amendment, whichever the Department believes appropriate.
5. That the Department report back on its mechanisms for keeping public contact open in the local area.

Mr. Nawi seconded the motion.

Mr. O'Dell expressed his concern about linking the approval of this motion to the modification of the Camp Three and Brandon Gulch plans. He believes that it gets into some murky waters in terms of compliance and the tinkering with these environmental compliance documents. He commented that he could not support that.

Mr. Heald commented for clarification that the Department would provide a detailed description of desired future conditions that they intend to establish with the style of management in those two plans and the comparison with the desired future conditions that they intend to establish under late successional stage management and that comes forward either as a specific example or as a proposed amendment to this Plan. He had not suggested that they provide or be required to provide any amendment to an existing THP.

Mr. O'Dell believes that the implication is that the Board might take action, which would then influence the timing of those operations.

A roll call vote was taken:

Bosetti	Aye
Heald	Aye
Marckwald	Aye
Nawi	Aye
Britting	Aye
O'Dell	Nay
Dixon	Aye

The motion passed by a 6-1 vote.

Director Tuttle thanked the Board for the serious consideration it has put into the discussion and adoption of this plan. The Department will be complying with the terms of the Board's approval. She commented that the new parkland provides the opportunity for comparison and the ability to produce later seral with the Management Plan.

**CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE BOARD'S MARCH AND APRIL 2002 TIMBER HARVESTING PLAN
SUBMISSION AND REVIEW WORKSHOPS, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION AND PRIORITIZATION OF
OPPORTUNITIES TO IMPROVE THE PROCESS, AS WELL AS REDUCE THP PROCESSING TIMES, WITHIN
STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS**

Chairman Dixon introduced the topic.

Mr. O'Dell provided some background on the original petition. He commented that he and Member Marckwald tried to get a view of what was talked about and where it would lead. He believes that there are some areas that

the Board should talk about amongst themselves and with others who are affected. Getting the Board to agree with the expectations on where to go with this information and how to schedule a public process to address these issues is necessary. It is important not to begin something that cannot be completed. He indicated that the Board should put some boundaries on what projects should be attempted.

Mr. Marckwald commented that there is a broad array of concerns that people have, but he expressed concern that nothing would be accomplished if there are no boundaries.

Mr. O'Dell believes that reporting back to the users and the people who make the process work is necessary to ensure that there is a reporting function. There needs to be support from all participants for the process to work. He commented that the THP process is adversarial and very complex and often participants do not have complete knowledge. There is a need for accountability for timelines and training and cross training are essential. Workshops seem to be the best forum and there is a need to be issue focused. He believes that there is a need for reaffirmation of the CEQA process.

Mr. Marckwald commented that both he and Member O'Dell believe that there should be some Board discussion and then open it for general discussion. He outlined the items and possible procedure for discussion and wanted to know if these are the right items, are there others, and should they be combined.

Mr. O'Dell commented that the Board does not know enough about the THP process and he believes that there is a need for better exchange of information on this process between Board members, plan applicants, and the public.

Chairman Dixon suggested that possibly Board members should participate in the THP process. The filing standards issue is of great importance.

Mr. O'Dell indicated that he could take Chairman Dixon out on a pre-harvest inspection.

Chairman Dixon commented that the list as presented by Members Marckwald and O'Dell reflects the basic issues that came out of the workshops. He indicated that he was not sure that the adversarial process is all bad. California is the leading state in the Union for public involvement, he does not believe that there is a way around that process. However, he would like for the Board to address that issue in an effort to make it more productive, and he would like for the filing standards issue to be address.

Mr. Bosetti commented that the defined items outlined by Member O'Dell are the key points that were discussed in the workshops. He believes that the filing standards issue is the number one priority and that there needs to be consistency in the standards used by the department in determining what is accurate, complete, and in proper order. The adversarial environment will always exist between those who are proposing a project and those members of the public who oppose it, but when agencies that are part of the review process become adversarial with each other or the plan submitter the process stalls. It is important for the members of the review team to review plans with the notion that the plan submitter is entitled to service from government in gaining approval of his project. He believes that there should be Board involvement to resolve disputes between the Department and other review team agencies and that the Board should give more attention to improving the timeliness of the THP approval process. He mentioned that it was important to remember that the workshops were held as a response to a petition from Jere Melo that asked the Board to adopt a Plan Submitter's Bill of Rights.

Mr. O'Dell commented that the petition was used as a guide in the workshops and the petitioner was satisfied that he received a response from the Board. He believes that it is the responsibility of the Board to respond to the inquiries of the petitioner and the appeal for service.

Mr. Marckwald commented that he was open to the concept of having an ombudsman, but believes that it should be at the Department level with the Board providing oversight.

Mr. Heald commented that the Board has put into motion a review process for new regulations with a spring or early summer check point. He suggested that the Board have a dedicated time where the Board hears from each

of the agencies that are involved in the review process once or twice a year. The suggestion of finding a way to attend a pre-harvest inspection would help the members keep in touch with what happens in the field. He believes that there is a need to get feedback on the IWMA. The filing standard in the form of a checklist is an important issue. A functional checklist would be of the greatest value.

Mr. Rynearson commented that the Board has an opportunity to provide a catalyst for the agencies to get together and review the issues. He believes that there needs to be more workshops with the other agencies and that Boards and Commissions need to work closer together. The Board has served as the ombudsman and needs to continue in that direction. He thanked Members O'Dell and Marckwald for consolidating the list.

There was some further discussion.

Chairman Dixon commented that the Board should review the list and provide feedback to staff during the first week in December.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE BOARD'S TASKS AND GOALS FOR 2003, INCLUDING REGULATORY PRIORITIES, POLICY REVIEW AND REVISION, AND THE FOCUS AND COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD'S STANDING COMMITTEES

Chairman Dixon announced that due to the time constraints, the Board would consider this item in January 2003.

There was a brief discussion.

Chairman Dixon asked the members to email their thoughts to him for discussion in January.

PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE RANGE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE SPONSORED STUDY: A SURVEY ON RESOURCE PROFESSIONALS

Dr. Kenneth Tate, UCD Rangeland Watershed Specialist, provided a Power Point presentation for the Board. Following his presentation he provided a CD for the record. The workshop objectives are to facilitate on-the-ground discussion among natural resource professionals about the cause, priority, remedy, and approach to achieve the timely correction of typical sources of water resource impairments found on California's rangelands. The target audience is local and regional professionals who work with landowners to protect rangeland water resources. In summary, this project served as a forum for dozens of site-specific discussions between natural resource professionals about specific range management and water resource interactions. A massive dataset was collected and analyzed, revealing professional opinions on the priority, cause, and remedy of common water resource impairments on California rangelands. The results of this project will be integrated into the UCCE-NRCS Ranch Water Quality Planning short course and other extension education venues for landowners and managers. These results will also be incorporated into continuing education venues conducted by UCCE, NRCS, and other agencies. Finally, these results will be published in appropriate natural resources journals.

PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY SEDIMENT, LARGE WOODY DEBRIS, AND MACROINVERTEBRATE DATA RESULTING FROM THE SOUTHERN EXPOSURE RESEARCH PROJECT LOCATED IN THE ANTELOPE CREEK WATERSHED IN TEHAMA COUNTY

Ms. Cajun James, Sierra Pacific Industries, commented that she was here to provide the Board with the 2002 update for the Southern Exposure Experimental Forestland that was designated that year. She introduced Dr. Lee Benda of Lee Benda and Associates, Inc., and Dr. Morgan Hannaford from Shasta College and provided a Power Point presentation on temperature, large woody debris/sediment, and macroinvertebrate data from the Southern Exposure Research Site (SERS), which is located in the Antelope Creek watershed in Tehama County.

Ms. James provided some background information on the SERS for the Board. She continued with the presentation and commented that the research project has been very expensive and labor intensive. She

commented that over the past three years, the SERS has shown no change or increase in stream temperature patterns.

Dr. Morgan Hannaford, Shasta College, commented that he has been involved in water quality monitoring and urban forest environments in the past. He provided a Power Point on large-scale experiments that Sierra Pacific was doing and an introduction to bio-monitoring and rapid bio-assessment techniques currently in use in California.

Dr. Lee Benda provided a Power Point presentation reviewing the wood and sediment budgets constructed for the Southern Exposure site and the protocols for wood budgeting.

Ms. James thanked the Board for allowing the presentations and commented that UCB is very happy with the collaboration that has occurred with the Board. This study is contributing to the understanding of the methodologies. She urged the Board to believe in the science and commented that they would provide an update next year.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

CALIFORNIA FOREST PEST COUNCIL REPORT

Mr. Scott Johnson, Chairman of the California Forest Pest Council (CFPC), the CFPC's 51st Annual Meeting would be held on November 21 & 22, 2002. He provided a copy of the agenda for that meeting and reviewed it for the Board. On November 4, 2002, the Ninth Court Circuit of Appeals put out a decision on an Oregon case against the Region 6 Regional Forester, which has to do with biological insecticides for the Douglas-fir moth. The case holds that the aerial spraying of the pesticide being conducted as a point-source pollution requiring an NPDS permit under the Clean Water Act. He will keep the Board informed on the issue. He commented that he had a chance to participate in a cross training between the Department of Pesticide Regulation, the Department of Forestry, and the State and Regional Water Boards. It was a good chance for people to compare notes.

PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS EXAMINING COMMITTEE (PFEC)

Mr. George Gentry reported that the PFEC met at Blodgett Forest on October 24, 2002. The PFEC is still discussing the Reciprocity Agreement with Maine. This Agreement has been forwarded to the PFEC Counsel for review. The Registered Professional Exam occurred on October 17, 2002. He thanked retired CDF employee, Ken Nehoda, for acting as a proctor as a last minute replacement for Ron Adams.

Mr. Gentry referred to the RPF Stats in the binder and asked that the Revocation section be continued until the January 2003 meeting. He then asked for action on the request for license withdrawal by Mervin Pyorre, RPF 1494 and the withdrawal of certification by James Morrison, CRM 26.

02-11-4 Mr. O'Dell moved to approve the request for withdrawal for Mervin Pyorre, RPF 1494 and James Morrison, CRM 26. Mr. Heald seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

Mr. Gentry asked for action on the request for voluntary relinquishment of certification by Denise Van Keuren, CRM 50.

02-11-5 Mr. Rynearson move to approve the request for voluntary relinquishment by Denise Van Keuren, CRM 50. Mr. O'Dell seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

Mr. Gentry commented that the terms of two PFEC members would expire on January 5, 2003; Chairman Ferrier and Mike Stroud. He requested that the Board form a nominating committee. He commented that it would be necessary to have a nominating committee formed to review nominees.

Chairman Dixon asked Members O'Dell and Rynearson to serve in that capacity and they agreed.

Mr. Bosetti asked that staff determine if there was a similar condition with the RMAC membership.

REPORT OF THE SENSITIVE SPECIES WORKING GROUP, INCLUDING REMCOMMENDATIONS RELATIVE TO THE LISTING PROCESS ASSOCIATED WITH BOARD'S SENSITIVE SPECIES CLASSIFICATION

Chairman Dixon introduced the topic.

Mr. Rynearson excused himself from the meeting and apologized to Dr. Berbach for missing his presentation and wanted a copy to review later.

Dr. Marty Berbach, Department of Fish and Game (DFG) and the Working Group's Facilitator, commented that due to time constraints, he would forego his Power Point presentation and provide the Board with hard copies and review it with them. He noted that the report was an update of the Sensitive Species Working Group (SSWG). He reviewed the background for the members. There are four objectives: Evaluate the necessity of the "Sensitive Species" designation and associated protections; Evaluate the relationship between DFG's "Species of Special Concern" and the Board of Forestry's "Sensitive Species" rules; Evaluate the applicability of the Board's "Sensitive Species" rules; and Establish criteria for keeping the Board's Sensitive Species" list current. He then reviewed the SSWG membership for the Board. Since the July meeting in Redding, there have been six meetings and the next meeting would be held on November 14, 2002, in Redding. He read the SSWG Goal Statement into the record and commented that it was a work in progress. He reviewed each of the objectives for the Board. He commented that the SSWG is still meeting and would like to continue. The SSWG's goal is to have a package to the Board by its March 2003 meeting.

REPORT OF INTERIM, RESOURCE PROTECTION, AND AD HOC WATERSHED COMMITTEES

Chairman Dixon commented that since two members have had to leave, the Committee reports would be continued until January.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Mr. Daniel Sendek, Executive Officer for the Board, commented that June would be good time for a Joint workshop and field trip with the State Water Board. He noted that he had confirmed the Joint Fish and Game Commission meeting for May 2003. On Monday he received an appeal of a THP from the Department of Parks and Recreation regarding a Santa Cruz County plan. He explained the appeal to the Board. He commented that after referring with Counsel, it was determined that there is no provision for that state agency to appeal and he sent them that response. He reported that he attended the Anadromous Salmonid Workshop in Redding and that it was well attended. There was a presentation by Dr. Donald Chapman a fisheries biologist from Idaho. He provided a video presentation of his testimony in federal court regarding the designation of critical habitat by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); there was an issue regarding fish blockage. He commented that Dr. Chapman would be providing a CD copy of that presentation and he would provide copies for the Board.

Chairman Dixon commented that during the Resource Protection Committee meeting, Kevin Shafer, DFG, announced that he would no longer be staffing that committee. He has been assigned to working with the *Ad Hoc* Watershed Committee to focus on the Coho. Mr. Shafer wanted to know what staffing would be available to work on the Memorandum of Understanding between Fish and Game and the Board. Chairman Dixon asked the Board's E.O. to work with his counterpart from Fish and Game to try and get more participation by the Commission during these Joint meetings.

Member Marckwald commented that it might be a good idea for Board members to approach Commission members on this issue as well.

NEW AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chairman Dixon asked for any new or unfinished business. There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Dixon adjourned the November 2002 meeting of the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

ATTEST:

Daniel R. Sendek
Executive Officer

Stan Dixon
Chairman

Copies of the attendance sheets can be obtained from the Board Office.